

28 Sept 84 Bill Cury Washington

Wf Reagan is winning (WC thought it 60% likely he would win, a year ago).

- (a) Popular personality
- (a) Rising economy
- (c) a sense that the economy is fragile — the party will be over soon; they want to enjoy it now. To elect Mondale would be to admit it is already over, and to end it sooner.

Reagan:

He won a debate with the Democrats

- (b) Coming after recent economic troubles, and a generation of stress, conservatism, isolationism: A desire to party, to relax, enjoy good and privilege. (Econ insecurity does not breed critical, dissenting society.

[E.g.: '60's came after prolonged growth: little memory of Depression, unlike '40's + '30's.]

Reagan "was an argument with the Democrats"; he pointed out to lower-middle-class whites that they were not being listened to, considered, by states & Dems; and gave them a solution, "getting the welfare state off their backs."

Easy to sell to a man low on the ladder that his problems come from the man (women, children) on the rungs below him.

The alternative: to pin his problems on the man above him. This, Dems (since RFK) have been unwilling to do.

[Also: appeal to masculinity, patriotism, religion, "morality."]

Cab-driver in Wash, 28 hpts (driving back from vigil in Lafayette Park):

Why is R winning?

"Because there's more bad than good in us. He represents the bad in us in the greed and fear. He speaks for the Devil."

Cuny: If Reagan is re-elected, there will be no Freeze. Ever. By 1989, new generation of weapons (Star Wars) will have too much momentum. Reagan will not "allow" Congress to pass a Quick Freeze. If we don't do it.

[WC doesn't take into account possibility that war in Central America will motivate enough resistance to make a Quick Freeze possible, perhaps in 1987 - after lobbying 1985-86 and electoral effort in 1986: no program].

[He thinks R admin thinks that war will smoke the anti-nuclear movement: which Kable also fears.]

WC sees the prospect with some equanimity - he plans to withdraw from Freeze after Nov, write a book on campaign, run for Congress from Conn in 1986. (Still anti-Hart; and anti-Quick Freeze, as distraction of field (?) from election).

(Chair G)
Freeze should be reorganized; million-member org (\$15/yr). (Notes Roche, and Pan, less.)

One Exec Committee ("not 3 big Committees for a 1.2 million org.). Elected leaders / spokesmen (Ready is stiff). Movement has generated & permitted no stars; Caldwell is best-known; and she is low-down in negotiation. Revolution to membership org comes mainly from staff who fear losing their positions.

Mort Halperin: 27 Sept 84 (before Lafayette Park
ingib.)

He is organizing discussions with Guy of Four
plus William Kaufman, Dick Ullman,

see WWR
new
Brookings
Book.

^{action and}
to implement NFO; including its consequences for the shape
and scale of nuclear force.

- No continued hold-up is necessary. But US would
make a commitment to a permanent troop presence
in Europe. (It does not have the now!)

The assurance that an attack on Europe would
mean war with the US is an adequate deterrent.

("Dunkirk" is the model; US would continue to be
at war.)

["NFO"; no use except in retal. to a nuclear
attack on US or its troops (not, "or its allies").

[GET: His draft of book, at JFK School.]

(2) Wants meeting — in Cambridge:

Forsberg, Kehler, Paine

— York. poll on FO

[L. that in Lafayette Park, for — AFSC and
Clair Thompson were not aware of our explicit and
"real" FO commitment in Europe (or real, but commit,
FO plan elsewhere); thought our policy was "not to
confirm or deny poss. of FO," kept open hypothetical
poss.

Ref to Yorklandish poll recently (Chairman MCHH
promised to send this): ~60% of US citizens thought
we now have a NFO policy.)

US should not use nuclear weapons in event of SU non-agg.
attack on Eur.

	<u>149</u>	<u>184</u>
By 1990's, it <u>should</u> be policy of	38%	<u>74%</u>
US to use nukes if...		

18% agreed
77% disagree

see Wash Post/CBS poll - Why people support
R is full knowledge that his policies make me
even more likely

Short-term econ policy agreed
agree with his foreign policy

D

Is the Freeze of logs "the first step"?

(~~as a result~~)

Is it prior to any reductions?

("Freeze on production of, ^{say, B-1, Stealth,} ~~etc.~~)

(e.g., say, 1986...

before reductions in ... MX (MM III?)

priority will be roll-back in there!

D-5
PII + GLCHs
SLCHs...



10 Nov 84

Sola Jerkel:

It is not that Democrats wanted to lose, in 1983-84 (as Karp implied in Harper)

but that they ("bigwigs"; Karp says, too narrowly, "party bosses") are so committed to the same CW premises as the Republicans, that they will not contemplate or propose really different alternatives, even to win.

i.e. they would rather lose, ^{or take a (high) risk of losing} than promote real changes in our society, power structure, world role, or policies. ("Losing is a lesser evil.")

(Likewise, Presidents — and military — don't "want" war — but they would risk or accept war as a "lesser evil" under some circumstances; or, fail to avert it rather than inquire, discuss, promote, choose, certain ~~alt. strategies~~ strategies that might be attractive to war or to avert policies risking war.

They will not act to reduce the risks of war by considering or adopting "taker policies."

Thus, "gaining or keeping office" is not the highest aim even of Party bureaucrats, or national security officials;

nor is, "avoiding nuclear war" or reducing its risks.

(Sola: We need "our own" TV stations.

(We need to learn methods of access

to TV (non-paid-commercials): "free tree."

(What Mondale failed to exploit.)

("Cable"?

Satellite?

Video?

"Outlaw" (thrifts)?

— Computer networks

"Media consultants"; PR.

Sola:

Mass Republican registration drives were much more efficient, productive (than Jesse Jackson's). = Mail Fund-raising. (see Right).